

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claim 11 is cancelled, and claims 18-21 are added. Claims 1-10 and 12-17 remain in this application as amended herein. Accordingly, Claims 1-10 and 12-21 are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

Applicant expresses appreciation to Examiners Saltarelli and Miller for the telephone interview held with Applicant's attorney on February 8, 2006 in which proposed amendments to the claims were discussed. Changes to the claims based on the interview are incorporated herein.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Florin (U.S. Patent No. 5,583,560). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over Florin.

The Florin patent describes a transceiver that receives a repetitive data stream. As shown in FIG. 3b, a period of the repetitive data stream is formed of data representing the current day's program listing interleaved with weekly program listings, i.e., the period of date consists of today's data followed by Monday's weekly data, which is followed by today's data, which is then followed by Tuesday's weekly data, which is again followed by today's data, The most relevant sections of the data stream are then stored in a system memory. (See also col. 10, line 45 to col. 11, line 9). Therefore, Florin merely describes that the transceiver stores *sections of the repetitive data stream* in the system memory. Florin neither discloses nor suggests that the transceiver separates *one of the successively repeated periods of data* from the received repetitive data, and Florin neither discloses nor suggests that the transceiver stores the *one period of data* in system memory.

Also, Florin describes a remote control device having a list button that allows a user to view up to one week of current and future listings on a television screen. (See also FIGS. 12 and 16-17; col. 11, lines 44-56; col. 15, lines 12-20; and col. 16, lines 14-33). Florin, however, does not disclose or suggest that the system reads *one period* of the repetitive data from the system memory, and Florin does not disclose or suggest that the system restores the repetitive data using the one period of data *by successively repeating the one period of data plural times*.

Florin neither discloses nor suggests:

a distributed information storage unit operable to obtain the received repeating data from said reception processor, to separate one of the successively repeated periods of data from the received repeating data, to store the one period of data in a data storage device, to read the one period of data from the data storage device in response to a received command, to restore the repeating data using the one period of data by successively repeating the one period of data plural times, to generate a menu frame of items associated with the one period of data, to convert the menu frame into menu data having a format that can be used by the browser, and to deliver at least one of the restored repeating data and the menu data to said reception processor

as called for in claim 1.

It follows that Florin neither discloses nor suggests the combination in recited claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate the claim.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1, and each further defines and limits the invention set out in the independent claim. It follows that each of claims 2-3 is distinguishable over the Florin reference for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 8 defines a digital signal display method and calls for:

separating one of the successively repeated periods of data from the received repeating data;

storing the one period of data;

reading out the one period of stored data in response to a command; [and]

restoring the repeating data using the one period of stored data by successively repeating the one period of data plural times[.]

Therefore, for at least the same reasons set out above regarding claim 1, claim 8 is also patentably distinguishable over Florin.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), (i) claim 4 was rejected as being unpatentable over Florin in view of Logan (U.S. Patent No. 5,732,216); (ii) claims 5-6, 9-10, 12 and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over Florin in view of Boyle (U.S. Patent No. 6,118,870); (iii) claim 7 was rejected as being unpatentable over Florin in view of Martinez (U.S. Patent No. 4,928,177); and (iv) claims 13-14 and 16-17 were rejected as being unpatentable over Florin in view of Russo (U.S. Patent No. 5,619,247). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 4-7 and 12-14 depend from claim 1, and claims 9-10 and 15-17 depend from claim 8. Therefore, each of claims 4-7, 9-10, 12-17 is distinguishable over Florin at least for the reasons set out above.

The Logan patent describes a system for the disseminating audio recording information in which a subscriber downloads program segments arranged in a provisional order. Before playback, the subscriber can review and alter the provisional program selections and the sequence of the program selections. (See Fig. 2; and col. 7, lines 35-50). The patent is not concerned with a signal that includes repeating data and

therefore does not disclose or suggest restoring the repeating data using one period of the data. It follows that Logan does not remedy the deficiencies of the Florin reference.

The Boyle patent describes a publisher station that encrypts data and a DES key before the data and the DES key are transmitted to a subscriber station where the data and the DES key are decrypted. (See Figs. 1 and 3; and col. 3, line 53 - col. 4, line 38). Boyle is not concerned with a signal that includes repeating data, and therefore the patent does not disclose or suggest restoring the repeating data using one period of the data. It follows that Boyle does not remedy the deficiencies of the Florin patent.

The Martinez patent describes a two-way broadcast network. High data rate communication is carried out in a forward direction using a television signal, and low data rate communication is carried out in a return direction using an AM radio signal. The data may be sent over a conventional television channel during normally off hours. (See col. 11, lines 49-62). Martinez is not concerned with a signal that includes repeating data and therefore does not disclose or suggest restoring the repeating data using one period of the data. Thus, Martinez does not remedy the deficiencies of Florin.

The Russo patent is directed to a pay-per-play system in which video, audio and other programs are stored at a subscriber site for later playback. Russo does not disclose or suggest a broadcast signal that includes repeating data and therefore does not disclose or suggest restoring the repeating data using one period of the data. Russo therefore does not address the deficiencies of Florin.

It follows that neither Logan, Boyle, Martinez, nor Russo remedies the deficiencies of the Florin patent, and

therefore claims 4-7, 9-10, 12-17 are patentably distinct and unobvious over the cited references.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

New claims 18-19 depend from claim 1 and new claims 20-21 depend from claim 8, and therefore each of claims 18-21 is distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Support for new claims 18-21 is found, e.g., in FIG. 2 and in ¶¶ [0025] and [0031] of the specification.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: March 23, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant